REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims and cancelled non-method claims 1-6 and 13-18 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims were amended and cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

The cancellation of claims 1 and 5 renders moot the objection thereto. (OA3, pg. 2)

The cancellation of claims 13-18 renders moot the non-statutory subject matter rejection (35 U.S.C. §101) of these claims.

Applicants amended the Title to conform to the pending method claims.

1.   Claims 7, 10, and 12 are Patentable Over the Cited

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 10, and 12 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102(b)) by Davis (U.S. Patent No. 5,657,259). Applicants traverse.

Amended claim 7 recites a method for use in a computer system for converting a text representation of a number into a numeric representation of the number, said method comprising: maintaining a correspondence of number format descriptions to convertors, wherein the descriptions of the number formats indicate at least one of integer places, a decimal point, and decimal places; converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format indicating at least one of the integer places, the decimal point, and the decimal places without intending to indicate the numerical values of the numbers in the integer and decimal places; mapping the description of the number's format to the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format, wherein the convertor comprises a sequence of conversion code; and executing the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format to convert the text representation of the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code.

Applicants amended claim 7 to recite that the descriptions of the number formats indicate at least one of integer places, a decimal point, and decimal places and that the description resulting from the conversion indicates at least one of the integer places, the decimal point, and

the decimal places without intending to indicate the numerical values of the numbers in the integer and decimal places. These added requirements are disclosed in at least paras. 4, 19, 21, 23, and 24 of the Specification, which disclose that the description replaces numbers with the digit 9, leaving the decimal point in place so all integer and decimal places are represented by the digit "9". This conversion of the numerical values of the number with the digit "9" does not intend to indicate the actual numeric value.

The Examiner cited col. 8, line 55 to col. 9, line of Davis as disclosing the pre-amended claim requirement of maintaining a correspondence of number format descriptions to convertors (OA3, pg. 3), which now additionally recites that the descriptions of the number formats indicate at least one of integer places, a decimal point, and decimal places.

The cited cols. 8-9 discusses a TUnicodeNumerals class that accepts digit values for a text to binary conversion. The TUnicodeNumerals object selects a set of digits to use to perform the conversion.

The claims require a correspondence of number format descriptions to converters, where the descriptions indicate integer places, a decimal point, and decimal places. The cited cols. 8-9 do not disclose or mention this claim requirement because the cited Davis discusses a TUnicodeNumerals class that is used to perform a conversion that selects which set of digits to use for the conversion. The Examiner has not cited where Davis discloses or mentions that a set of digits to use for conversion comprises a correspondence of number formats indicating the integer places, decimal point and decimal places, to convertors that are used to perform the conversion. Instead, the cited cols. 8-9 discuss a TUnicodeNumerals class that performs the actual conversion.

The Examiner cited col. 7, lines 18-47 and col. 87, lines 31-51 of Davis as disclosing the pre-amended claim requirement of converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format (OA3, pg. 4), which now additionally recites indicating at least one of the integer places, the decimal point, and the decimal places without intending to indicate the numerical values of the numbers in the integer and decimal places. Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited col. 7 mentions a GetCanNormalize function that returns TRUE if a text string can be turned into a binary number and back into a text string with certain condition.

The cited col. 8 mentions a TNumerals class used by the number format for the individual numeral char-value mapping. This mapping maps numbers in a particular format to a value. These TNumerals objects maps a type of character set, e.g., Unicode, to values. A numeral value pair is an association of a UniChar and its numerical value.

The cited cols. 7 and 8 discuss converting text to a binary number and a TNumerals class used to map characters of a set to numbers. This cited cols. 7-8 do not disclose or mention the claim requirement of converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's format, where the format indicates the integer places, the decimal point, and the decimal places without intending to indicate the numerical values of the numbers in the integer and decimal places. The cited cols. 7 and 8 discuss converting text to numbers and a mapping of characters to numbers, but do not disclose or mention converting the text representation of a number to a number format indicating integer and decimal places without indicating the numerical values of the number to convert.

The Examiner cited col. 8, lines 16-51 as disclosing the claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format, wherein the convertor comprises a sequence of conversion code. (OA3, pg. 4)

The cited col. 8 discusses the above discussed TNumerals class used by the number format for a numeral character to value mapping, to map characters of a set, such as Unicode, to numerical values.

The cited col. 8 does not disclose mapping a number format to a convertor comprising a sequence of conversion code to convert the text representation of the number. Instead, the cited col. 8 discusses how characters of a character set map to numerical values. Such a character to number mapping does not disclose determining conversion code that corresponds to a description of the number's format that indicates the integer and decimal places without indicating the numerical values.

Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over the cited art because the cited Davis does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 10 and 12 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claim 7, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

2.   Claim 8 is Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claim 8 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Turpin (U.S. Patent No. 5,608,898).   (OA3, pg. 6)

Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over the cited art because it depends from base claim 7, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

3.   Claim 9 is Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claim 9 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Davis in view of Omori (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0086861).   (OA3, pg. 6)

Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over the cited art because it depends from base claim 7, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of claim 9 provides further grounds of patentability over the cited art for the following reasons.

Claim 9 depends from claim 7 and further requires that wherein the text representation of the number is converted into a description of the number's format by a translate instruction using a translate table.

The Examiner cited pg. 11, para. [0166] of Omori as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (OA3, pgs. 6-7) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0166] mentions that text data of sequence information on a complete set of DNA can be converted into binary form by using a table. However, these dependent claims additionally require using a translate table to convert a text representation of the number into a description of the number's format. The cited para. [0166] does not teach this additional requirement because para. [0166] discusses converting a text of a DNA sequence into binary form using a table. There is no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of using a translate table to convert a text representation of the number into a description of the number's format.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 6, 12, and 18 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited combination.

4.   Claim 11 is Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner did not include claim 11 in the listing of any rejections using Davis or other combinations of art. On page 5, the Examiner mentioned claim 11 by stating that "per … [claims] 10-13 … the applicant discloses limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1, 4, and 6 respectively … [and] are similarly rejected." (OA3, pg. 5)

Applicants submit that claim 11 is patentable over the cited art because it depends from claim 7, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, claim 11 includes additional requirements, such as concerning the mapping of the number's format to an index, that are not included in the requirements of claim 1.

Applicants submit that the Examiner has not cited any part of the art that teaches the requirements of claim 11. Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection of claim 11 does not comply with the requirements for claim rejections specified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which requires that:

> When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

37 CFR §1.104(c)(2); MPEP Sec. 707.

Applicants request that the Examiner show how specific sections of the cited references disclose specific requirements of claim 11 if the rejection of claim 11 is maintained in order to provide applicants an opportunity to concisely respond.

5.   Added Claims 19-20

Added claim 19 depends from claim 11 and further requires determining whether the index comprises a valid index, wherein the mapping of the description of the number's format to the convertor comprises using the index to determine the convertor corresponding to the description of the number's format.

The added requirements of claim 19 are disclosed in paras. 29-30 and FIG. 3 of the Specification.

Added claim 19 depends from claim 19 and further requires returning an error indicating that no conversion was performed in response to determining that the index does not comprise a valid index.

The added requirements of claim 20 are disclosed in paras. 29-30 and FIG. 3 of the Specification.

Added claims 19 and 20 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claim 7, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base and intervening claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 7-12, 18, and 19 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for a one-month extension of time. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 6, 2008

By: _/David Victor/_

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984